

Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano

Sherman  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney

Towns  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

Pearce  
Pryce (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Stupak  
Visclosky  
Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2152

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NAYS—217

Aderholt  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Bereuter  
Biggett  
Billirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Cox  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cunningham  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor

Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (OK)  
Manzullo  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter

Oxley  
Paul  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Saxton  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—22

Akin  
Ballance  
Blumenauer  
Boehlert  
Bradley (NH)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Case  
Doolittle  
Fletcher  
Gephardt  
Goss  
Gutierrez  
Knollenberg  
McCollum  
McCotter  
Miller (NC)

# WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 424 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 424

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration is waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 424 is a rule providing for the consideration of a conference report to accompany H.R. 3289, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that in its particulars, the conference agreement is largely consistent with the House passed version of the supplemental. In the aggregate, the agreement provides a total of \$87.5 billion, which is \$500 million above the President's request. Of that sum, \$18.6 bil-

lion is provided for Iraq relief and reconstruction, which is \$1.7 billion below the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, now that the House and Senate conferees have reached agreement on this emergency supplemental, it is imperative that we move without delay to make these funds available both to our troops in the field and for the vitally important work of rebuilding Iraq.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a supporter of our efforts to replace Saddam Hussein's dangerous dictatorship with a stable and democratic Iraq. But I am deeply concerned that the Bush administration's stubborn refusal to be honest about Iraq has made the reconstruction process more difficult, more expensive and more dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush said it best earlier this week at a press conference in the Rose Garden. In talking about the United Nations, he said, "Credibility comes when you say something is going to happen and then it does happen. You are not credible if you issue resolutions and then nothing happens."

Well, that is exactly the situation President Bush has created for himself, a growing credibility gap that could threaten our ability to win the peace in Iraq.

Before the war, the Bush administration refused to prepare the American people for the costly and deadly reconstruction effort they are now witnessing. And whenever people like General Eric Shinseki let slip the truth, that it would be very expensive and require lots of troops, the administration publicly rebuked them, and then relieved them of duty.

On May 1 of this year, President Bush dressed up in a flight suit and had a pilot land him on an aircraft carrier so that he could declare victory in Iraq. Since then, nearly 120 American troops have been killed in action, more than before the President's May 1 victory speech, and nearly 1,200 have been wounded.

In recent days, however, the Bush administration has reached a new low in its well-documented PR campaign to spin Americans into believing that the bad news coming out of Iraq these days is actually good news.

On Tuesday, President Bush defended his May 1 "victory" pep rally by blaming the whole affair on the sailors of the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, as if he had somehow been the victim of the Navy's public relations stunt. That is not only an outrageous charge, especially coming from the man who runs the slickest White House PR machine ever, it is utterly unbelievable. After all, back in

May, the Bush White House bragged to reporters that the President himself helped devise the event, and the New York Times reported that his aides "had choreographed every aspect of the event."

Perhaps most disturbing, however, was the President's response to the series of sophisticated and deadly attacks against U.S. soldiers and our allies earlier this week. Sitting in the White House with Ambassador Bremer on Monday, President Bush tried to convince Americans that this was actually a sign of progress, that it proved how "desperate" these Iraqi insurgents have become.

This is what he told reporters who asked about the bombings, "Again, I will repeat myself, that the more progress we make on the ground, the more desperate these killers become."

□ 2200

That statement, Mr. Speaker, was literally incredible. When terrorists can coordinate multiple, separate attacks to kill 35 people and wound more than 230 people in just 45 minutes, it is a horrible tragedy, one that indicates a very real security problem on the ground in Iraq. And trying to spin it as good news simply undermines the President's credibility and harms our effort to win the peace in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush's credibility problem is such a serious concern because America cannot afford to fail in Iraq. That is why so many people took notice earlier this week, when Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a Republican, who supports our efforts in Iraq and who knows as well as anyone the lessons of Vietnam, said, "This is the first time that I have seen a parallel to Vietnam in terms of information that the administration is putting out versus the actual situation on the ground." It makes it harder to convince our allies around the world to shoulder some of the burden for rebuilding Iraq. That forces American taxpayers and American soldiers to bear the lion's share of the cost. And that makes it harder to maintain public support for this expensive and dangerous effort.

Mr. Speaker, that is why Democrats, and a few conscientious Republicans, have tried to force the Bush administration to account for the hundreds of billions of dollars it is spending in Iraq. And it is why we have tried to force the Bush administration to stop making American taxpayers pay the entire tab for this latest foreign aid package. After all, before war, the American people were told that Iraq was an oil-rich country that could fund its own reconstruction. Obviously, Iraq's proven oil reserves have not disappeared and America still has its own unmet priorities, like homeland security, education and health care. But now the Bush administration insists that Iraqi oil money can only be used to repay the debts that Saddam Hussein ran up to build his war machine and that U.S.

taxpayers have to foot the bill for rebuilding Iraq. So Republican leaders have stripped out of this conference report the Senate's loan language.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. taxpayers are already struggling under the mountain of debt the Bush administration has run up. And there is no good reason to force U.S. taxpayers to pay for President Bush's failure to convince our allies to help. That is why majorities in both Houses of Congress voted in favor of turning about half of the reconstruction grants into loans. But sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it seems like President Bush does not understand how seriously his credibility on Iraq has been damaged. Unfortunately, as long as the Bush administration refuses to treat the American people with more respect, it will become increasingly difficult to achieve a goal we all share, winning the peace in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), a valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are moments in history where we know the decisions we are making will affect the world in the future. Today we stand at such a moment, charged with the enormous task of helping to rebuild Iraq. Our own history offers us guidance about how to best rebuild a wartime adversary.

After World War I, Germany was soundly defeated and the parties gathered in Versailles to negotiate the terms of surrender. The talks came to a question of who was responsible for the aftermath. Was Germany responsible? Should a country with a new government be burdened by the debts of a defeated regime? Should they be responsible for reconstruction or for reparations? We all realize how the reparations inflicted upon Germany at that time created an atmosphere of despair. We are also aware of how that atmosphere was exploited by the evil monster Adolf Hitler. Mr. Speaker, we know how that story ended in Germany, and it could end up that way in Iraq.

But after World War II, an alliance, once again scarred by battle, sat across from debt-heavy and defeated nations, and the alliance did not make the same mistake of 1918. The United States eventually formulated a systematic recovery program that became known as the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan was not entirely made up of U.S. aid. It also called upon the European nations to eventually contribute to their own recovery. Yet the first installment of \$4 billion in aid required great political will. At that time, \$4 billion represented 13 percent of the entire budget. That act of congressional courage helped to make Western Europe into a subcontinent of strong economies, strong democracies and, thus, strong allies.

It is my belief that this assistance may allow a free and democratic Iraq to become a beacon of hope in the Middle East. It will show the people of that region that democracy is possible, that the United States does not impose its will, only the ability for people to decide their own destiny.

That is why I applaud President Bush for setting the course of reconstruction in Iraq. Encouraging progress is already happening. Schools are opening. Electricity is turning on. New currency is being distributed. As the Iraqi people see continued progress in rebuilding, we help keep Americans safe at home. In a section of the world that has already imperiled too many lives, in a country whose previous savage regime caused too much suffering and too many deaths, we in Congress should be inspired by the lessons of our history to support an emerging Iraqi democracy with our wisdom, our experience, and our resources.

The vote we are about to cast will have enormous repercussions. If this assistance has the same effect that the Marshall Plan funding had in Western Europe, it will help toward the creation of a stable, democratic Iraqi government and a lifelong ally of the United States. It is with that hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will support this supplemental appropriation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Halloween and scary costumes are the order of the day. What is going to be the scariest costume of them all? The school-teacher outfit with 60 children to teach? The small business suit with the bankruptcy notice? Or the elderly costume with its inadequate health care? Without a doubt, the desert camouflage uniform of the U.S. military is the scariest costume of all. Without flak jackets, traveling in nonarmored Humvees and without jammers to block incoming bombs, United States soldiers were sent to battle unprepared for the postwar hostilities they encountered and ill equipped to defend themselves. And all of us have a responsibility to all of them. But they are living a nightmare.

This is the consequence of rushing to war. Congress has been begging the administration for a comprehensive plan to stabilize Iraq and an exit strategy to bring our troops home. There has been no response. Instead, President Bush has presented us a bill that we are voting on soon demanding \$87 billion, having not accounted in full for the \$66 billion that was granted previously. The billions of dollars in this supplemental are not intended to get us out of Iraq. They are intended, in some respects, to keep us there, perhaps indefinitely.

Realize what \$87 billion could buy. To get some perspective here or some real-life comparisons about \$87 billion and

how it could benefit the American taxpayer:

\$87 billion is more than the combined total of all State budget deficits in the United States. \$87 billion is approximately the total of 2 years' worth of all U.S. unemployment benefits. \$87 billion is more than double the total amount the government spends on homeland security. \$87 billion is 87 times the amount the Federal Government spends on after-school programs.

The priorities of the President were those that in many respects were stripped out; but to add further insult to financial injury, billions of taxpayer dollars have been spent already on no-bid contracts for major U.S. corporations. In yet another tall tale from the administration, we were told that the funds for rebuilding Iraq must be in the form of grants to encourage other nations in the donor conference in Madrid the other day in rebuilding Iraq. Yet a total of \$18 billion was pledged at the Madrid donors conference last week and \$14 billion of that amount was in the form of loans. Therefore, there is no overarching reason for providing this money only in the form of grants.

It is fundamentally flawed logic to expect the American taxpayer to incur a debt for problems America has not created. We are not rebuilding an Iraq that we destroyed. We are rebuilding an infrastructure decimated by Iraq's former dictator. What we owe the Iraqi people is an opportunity for a democratic way of life, and it is not unreasonable to expect them to shoulder the cost. Freedom and democracy never come cheap. They are exorbitantly expensive in terms of money and sacrifice. The continuing propaganda from the White House regarding Iraq is distracting our attention from Afghanistan and other countries.

In my view, everyone should vote against this measure.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report that this rule seeks to bring to the House floor. During House consideration of this bill, I pledged that I would not write the Bush administration a blank check of the taxpayers' money for the \$18.6 billion in reconstruction funds for Iraq. I pledged not to write a blank check for a plan with no exit strategy, no clear link to this supplemental, and no details for after January of this coming year. I pledged not to hand over \$18.6 billion of the taxpayers' money to build Iraq's electricity infrastructure when ours is not functioning here at home. I pledged not to sanction the use of American money to modernize Iraq's

medical facilities and medical equipment when millions of Americans here at home are living without health care. And I pledged not to spend the American people's money to pay for that which we did not damage and that which did not previously exist in Iraq. I pledged not to send \$18.6 billion in grants to a country that has the second largest oil reserves in the world, worth approximately \$7 trillion. Why should Iraq not be expected to pay back this money? And I pledged not to add another \$18.6 billion to this year's deficit, estimated already at over \$480 billion.

Each of us in this Chamber has a responsibility to the American people to demand an Iraq package that will not bankrupt future generations. That is why the American people still support creating a loan package for Iraq, not a grant. Iraq can and should pay back the money for reconstruction with their future oil reserves. Period. Evidently, I reached the same conclusion many of the nations and organizations at the Madrid donors conference reached themselves. That conference only produced \$4 billion in grants and roughly \$13 billion in loans and trade credits, that amount toward a total estimated Iraqi need of \$56 billion over the next 4 years. So, Mr. Speaker, this is not the last time that we will see moneys being brought by the administration for Iraq. And why should the American taxpayer not be paid back if the taxpayer in other countries, countries that did not support this effort, will be paid back?

The consequence of this grant approach is that the American taxpayer will pay more than he or she should, will pay more for Halliburton to make more. The President's suggestion that bombings in Iraq are a result of our success is outrageous. The bombings are a failure of our postintervention planning, not a symbol of success. And though I strongly support our American servicemembers and the money that is going to them in this bill, made much better because of Democratic efforts, I cannot in good conscience support this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the conference report.

□ 2215

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I stand here outraged because I am asked to vote for a bill that would give \$87 billion as a grant to a country that has billions of barrels of oil buried underground in reserve. At the same time, we have cut veterans services. I am outraged.

I am hurt, because our POW Shoshanna Johnson, the first African American female ever to be a prisoner of war, was disregarded and given 30 percent disability benefit. Oh, yes, Jessica Lynch got 80 percent.

We should be ashamed. This young woman spent 22 days as a captive. She told me that twice a week they would bring her a little bowl of water to wash with. She is going to leave the Service, and what does she have to look forward to? She was shot through both of her ankles, and they are only going to award her 30 percent disability.

Is that the way we treat our service personnel as veterans? Is that why we said to them, go into the Service, be all that you can be? We sent them over there in harm's way, and they served us well. And now they are coming home, and we are not serving them well, we are not serving her well. But we can give a country thousands of miles away our hard-earned tax dollars. There is something incredibly wrong with that.

I do not care what you snuck into the bill at the eleventh hour. I understand the money for California's fires, how cynical, is in this bill. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves.

So I am voting no. My veterans know I support them, my military people know I support them. I have been over to Walter Reed, I have let them see my face and know my support. So I do not have to play a game and vote for this bill, when we have problems right here in our own country.

We had an incident in Cannon, it was a failed system, because none of us were notified as to what was going on over there.

I just want to say to my colleagues, let us be truthful and let us be trustworthy, and let us treat the people of America right, and particularly those that we sent into harm's way, by choice. We were not attacked by Iraq. We chose to invade Iraq. Now, we are trying to rebuild a country at the expense of our own domestic needs.

I cannot do it, and I hope you will not do it. Let us honor America. Let us honor our own fighting forces. Let us take that money and put it to their welfare after they leave that country and go home. Let us welcome them in an American way, and treat them fairly. Let us vote no on this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one who voted for this supplemental last week because of our troops. Our troops need this help. We made the decision to send them into harm's way. They need the bulletproof vests to save their lives. That is in this request. They need the hydration systems to purify their water, so many of them are having dysentery from the water over there not being purified. There is so much, so we cannot turn our backs on our troops.

But we have a dilemma. The American people have a dilemma. The American people are asking some questions of this administration and each and

every one of us up here, Democrat and Republican, and that is this question: Where is the accountability for this money, these funds, to build Iraq?

I wish we could have set aside, and I worked hard to see if we could, the money for our troops, the \$67 billion, because that is another question. I do not think there is anybody in this House that would not vote to help our troops. But this House is in a convoluted state, just like this whole country is in a convoluted state, because there is a lack of accountability on this administration and this President for the monies that go to rebuild Iraq.

There are serious questions. If we do not raise those questions, if we do not answer those questions, it is not going to be so easy to come back and get money the next time, because the American people, I am here to tell you, have had it about up to here.

We are working with a country over there that is sitting on the world's second largest oil reserves, which arguably could be one of the richest countries in the world, and yet in this administration and in this supplemental there is not one timetable, there is not one direct amount of money that is going to get the oil wells producing, to get the oil production up and running at capacity. That should be the first business. Where is the money for that?

Why is there a cloud over the handling of this noncompetitive business? The American people are asking these questions. Halliburton and Bechtel, two companies, fine companies though they may be, but should they have non-bidding rights to get the taxpayers' money?

The American people are asking these questions. We owe it to them to ask these questions and get some answers. We have got to do it together, not as Democrats and Republicans, but together. We as a body must ask this administration to give the American people the accountability and the transparency on where this \$20 billion is going and how it is going to be spent, or else we all will lose our credibility, and that is something we must not do. The American people are counting on us to ask the questions of this administration on this money and get the answers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned previously, I have been a supporter of our action against Iraq, I voted for the supplemental, and I will vote for this conference report. I will tell you that there are serious questions that have been raised by Members on this side of the aisle, and even some Members on the other side of the aisle, particularly on the issue of whether all of this money, all of this \$20 billion, should be a grant, or whether at least a portion of it should be a loan.

These are serious questions. The House went on record and the Senate went on record in favor of some of this money being a loan, but, unfortunately, the conference committee did not see the wisdom in taking that position.

Members have indicated and have served notice, and I believe Members on the other side of the aisle should listen carefully, Members have served notice that it will be much more difficult for the administration next time they come to this body seeking more funds for reconstruction.

Members have been willing to give the administration the benefit of the doubt, even though they have very serious reservations, but I would hope that this administration and the Members on the other side of the aisle, before they return to this Congress asking for additional billions of dollars, will take a long and hard look at this issue of loans versus grants and take a long and hard look at the opinions of the American people who are very concerned about unmet needs here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this. In listening and thinking this through, I feel compelled to take the well.

I am one of the few on this side of the aisle that voted with President Bush the first time, as well as this President Bush, because I thought it was important, the right thing to do, that those of us who have said "never again" to tyrants must protect not just ourselves, but other people as well, and step up to the plate, and that it would be sinful not to do what we have to do in ridding the world of a tyrant. I am not sorry that I participated in that, because, indeed, it was the right thing to do, and remains so.

But things have happened and things have changed as we watch what has evolved, as we watch an administration that ran for office and continually talked about bringing morality back to government and taking personal responsibility, and suddenly seeing the evolving of what has happened here, which is truly mind-boggling.

Personal responsibility. Who knew what in the White House and when? Personal responsibility. Things starting to go wrong.

Where is the plan? Those of us who supported the action always said we were going to win the war. There was no doubt about it. You could not find an oddsmaker in Las Vegas to say that Saddam Hussein was going to win the war. The day, the amount of time, the casualties, that was always a question.

But the question that we pressed in the Committee on International Relations was, can you win the peace? What we have here is a Secretary of War who has now become the Secretary of Peace, and he does not know how to do it.

The President stood here in this House and said to us Members of both bodies assembled, "British intelligence tells us this." I think it is what Nixon called "plausible deniability."

I never heard a President say someone else's intelligence told us this. He was warned. He was warned by the CIA Director that that intelligence was wrong. Blame the British. Blame the CIA Director. Blame the brave men in the Navy on the *Abraham Lincoln*.

What happened to personal responsibility? Where is the plan? We have been deceived; we have been lied to, we in the Congress and the American people as well, and that is intolerable. People took the oath of office to tell the truth. Where is the truth?

Indeed, this is a dilemma. We have so many American lives on the line in that country, but the President owes us a plan. A company declares bankruptcy for a half a million dollars, they have to have a plan. For \$87 billion, there should be a plan. What is the plan? Nobody knows the plan.

"Trust us." Well, I have run out of trust in this administration. I do not mind that the emperor has no clothes; I mind that the emperor does not have a plan, because lives are at stake.

We want to protect our troops. Bring back a bill that would protect the troops. We are not going to leave them hanging out there. But to spend \$87 billion, and nobody knows how, nobody knows why, nobody knows where, nobody knows when, is something that is absolutely unconscionable, and something in which I can no longer participate.

I will be voting no.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule so we can get on to fund the very important operation that we have in the Mideast. I just remind my colleagues that more than 75 percent of this bill goes to make sure that our troops are secure in this theater.

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report accompanying H.R. 3289 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?